



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In reply to Application of: Parimal Pal Chaudhuri  
Application No.: 10/749,024  
Filing Date: December 30, 2003  
Art Unit: 2136  
Examiner: Fikremariam A. Yalew  
Confirmation Number: 9229  
Title: Systems and Method for Data Encryption and Compression (EnCompression)

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

**Subject: In Response to the objections raised by the examiner in office communication dated 9/19/2008 rejecting the claims registered in PATENT APPLICATION NO. 10/749,024**

In response to the Office Action notification on September 19, 2008, which includes rejection of claims sighting claims already granted to patent US 6456744 and US 5677956, the applicant strongly objects to all the claim rejections. The response is divided into seven sections, providing a thorough analysis and background of Cellular Automata (CA) for the examiner's benefit.

- I. The background of this document.
- II. Response to examiner's point numbers 3, 5 and 6 in respect of Claim Rejection 35 US101 (page 2 and 3 of referenced document).
- III. Basic difference of the Patent Application 10/749024 with US Patents 6456744 and 5677956.
- IV. Difference between **Compression** task in the integrated operation ENCOMPRESSION (ENcryption + COMPRESSION) in the application 10/749024 and the US Patent No. 645674.
- V. Difference between **Encryption** task in the integrated operation ENCOMPRESSION (ENcryption + COMPRESSION) reported in the application 10/749024 and the US Patent No. 6456744.
- VI. Difference between Single Integrated Operation referred to in the Patent Application 10/749024 and coined by the Inventor as: ENCOMPRESSION (ENcryption + COMPRESSION) versus the sequential execution of two operations - Compression followed by Encryption.
- VII. Response to Examiner's Point nos. 8 to 18 in respect of Claim Rejection 35 US 103 (pages 3 to 6 of referenced document).